

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3270827

80 The Drive, Collier Row, Romford, RM5 3UH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Charles Fadamiro against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1558.20 dated 26 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective rear extension at first floor plan.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a retrospective rear extension at first floor plan at 80 The Drive, Collier Row, Romford, RM5 3UH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P1558.20 dated 26 October 2020 and in accordance with the following condition:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PLN01/01 Elevations and Plans.

Procedural Matters

2. Whilst not completed, much of the development the subject of this appeal has already taken place.
3. Prior to the application the subject of this appeal, the Council granted planning permission¹ at 80 The Drive for a two-storey side extension and single front and rear storey extension, amongst other things. This followed on from two previous approvals² for development including a two-storey side extension.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and its effects on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of Number 82 The Drive, with regards to outlook, sunlight and daylight.

¹ Reference: P0122.19.

² Reference: P0218.15 and P01238.08.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling. It has been largely extended to the front, side and rear, although these works have not been completed.
6. The appeal property is located in a residential area, characterised by the presence of two storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings, set back from the road behind a wide pavement and front gardens and/or parking areas. Dwellings have long gardens to the rear. The presence of grass verges and green areas of public open space combine with these characteristics to afford the area a green, open and spacious character.
7. During my site visit, I observed that many properties in the surrounding area have been altered and/or extended such that the presence of changes to the front, side and rear of dwellings appears commonplace.
8. The appeal property already has planning permission for a front and two storey side extension. The development the subject of this appeal would result in little, if any, discernible difference in respect of the overall appearance of the appeal property and the adjoining semi-detached dwelling when seen from The Drive and the rear of the property is partly hidden from wider views as a result of its mature, private garden setting.
9. Consequently, the development would not “unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings” to any harmful degree. Rather, the impact of the development would be little different to that already approved and would be in keeping with the surrounding area, where there are plentiful examples of pairs of semi-detached dwellings of asymmetrical appearance.
10. Also, the roof of the development appears neither dominant nor intrusive, as it is largely hidden from the front, but, by adding a small gable feature, it provides an element of visual interest to the rear of the appeal property that reflects and appears in keeping with the gable-end style of its immediate neighbour, No 82 The Drive.
11. Further to the above, the development is not, as stated by the Council, constructed on the boundary with No 82, but is set away from it. This, together with the presence of a large visual gap between the two properties above No 82’s ground floor garage and the generous rear gardens to both dwellings, provides for a development that respects and retains the area’s spacious qualities.
12. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2016) Policy 7.4; Core Strategy³ policy DC61; or to the Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

³ Reference: Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008).

Living Conditions

13. Whilst the rear extension projects close to the rear of No 82 at two storey height, the resulting effects are minimal, if any, due in part to the presence of a garage to the side and a large outbuilding to the rear of No 82, close to the boundary with the appeal property.
14. Consequently, I find that the development would not result in any significant harm in respect of the levels of daylight and sunlight received by the neighbouring occupiers of No 82 and note that there is no substantive evidence to the contrary.
15. Further to the above, glimpses of the development from the rear of No 82 would be in the context of the large outbuilding and very long garden to the rear of that property. As such, the development would appear as a relatively small, albeit noting the comments above, sensitively designed rear projection that would reflect the gabled character of No 82 itself.
16. Consequently, the development would appear neither overbearing nor dominant and due to the presence of the No 82's rear outbuilding, would not appear as a "wall of development."
17. Taking everything into account, I find that the development would not harm the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers of No 82 The Drive, with regards to outlook, daylight and sunlight and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Core Strategy policy DC61; or to the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011), which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Conditions

18. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR